

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

THOMAS COVINGTON, JR.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	1:21-cv-385
	)	
BETTY BROWN, KATTY POOLE,	)	
CHARLIE LOCKLEAR, SARAHE	)	
MCLUCAS REGINAL BOWEN,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

This matter is before the court for review of the Memorandum Opinion and Recommendation ("Recommendation") filed on January 31, 2025, by the United States Magistrate Judge in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). (Doc. 42.) In the Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment be granted, and that Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment be denied. The Recommendation was served on the parties to this action on January 31, 2025. (Doc. 43). Plaintiff filed timely objections to the Recommendation. (Doc. 44.)

This court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [Magistrate Judge's] report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This court "may accept, reject, or


modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the [M]agistrate [J]udge. . . . [O]r recommit the matter to the [M]agistrate [J]udge with instructions." Id.

This court has appropriately reviewed the portions of the Recommendation to which objections were made and has made a de novo determination which is in accord with the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation. This court therefore adopts the Recommendation.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation, (Doc. 42), is **ADOPTED. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. 35), is **GRANTED** and Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. 38) is **DENIED**, and this action is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

A Judgment dismissing this action will be entered contemporaneously with this Order.

This the 3rd day of March, 2025.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
United States District Judge